



The impact of online reading tasks and reading strategies on EFL learners' reading test scores

İsmail Fırat Altay ^a * , Ayşe Altay ^b 

^a *Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey*

^b *Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey*

APA Citation:

Altay, İ. F., & Altay, A. (2017). The impact of online reading tasks and reading strategies on EFL learners' reading test scores. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 13(2)*, 136-152.

Submission Date: 11/06/2017

Acceptance Date: 18/09/2017

Abstract

Integration of technology in foreign language classes has long been a matter of interest for researchers. Yet, studies have often yielded indecisive and conflicting results. Besides, there have been few, if any, studies exploring the relationship between learners' use of metacognitive reading strategies and their performance in reading tests. The aim of this study is thus to investigate not only the impact of online reading tasks on tertiary level EFL students' test scores at a Public University in Turkey but also the role of metacognitive reading strategies they used on their test scores. A total of 51 Turkish-speaking adult learners took part in this study - 25 of them were in the experimental group who were assigned online reading tasks during the term, and another 26 students were in the control group who continued reading on paper. A pre-test and a post-test, which were paper-based, were given to the two groups consisting of 20 multiple choice and lasting 30 minutes each. To detect the learners' metacognitive reading strategies, Turkish version of Mokhtari and Reichard's (2002) Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies was conducted. The pre- and post-test scores of experiment and control group and their responses to the survey were statistically analyzed through SPSS version 20.0. The results indicated that there was not a significant difference between test scores of experiment and control group after 6-week treatment. Besides, a one-way ANOVA revealed that none of the strategies was favored by the learners. As such, the results showed that online reading tasks and reading strategies did not show any effect on learners' reading comprehensions. It was implicated in the study that stakeholders should be cautioned about the use of technology in the language classroom and expectances regarding online reading tasks potential to bring about changes in reading scores.

© 2017 JLLS and the Authors - Published by JLLS.

Keywords: Online reading tasks; metacognitive reading strategies; reading test scores

1. Introduction

With the increase of technological tools, the use of them in the field of education has become a necessity. This has also changed the way of teachers' and students' use of print and online materials. Most of the previous literature has focused on the perceptions and preferences of print and online sources (Liu, 2006; Lin, 2014). Accordingly, a growing body of literature investigates the perceptions of students on print and online reading texts (Ji, Michaels, & Waterman, 2014; Kayaoglu & Akbaş,

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +0-312-297-8575
E-mail address: ifaltay@hacettepe.edu.tr

2014; Lin, 2014;) as well as the strategies used in print and online reading environment (Anderson, 2003; Hsieh & Dwyer, 2009; Hong-Nam, Leavell, Maher, 2014, Park, Yang, & Hsieh, 2014).

There have been few, if any, studies exploring the relationship between online reading tasks and reading strategies on EFL learners' reading test scores. The aim of this study is thus to investigate not only the impact of online reading tasks on tertiary level EFL students' test scores at a Public University in Turkey but also the role of metacognitive reading strategies they used on their test scores in order to provide new insights on the inclusion of online reading tasks into the curriculum.

1.1. Literature review

Research indicates that technology has the potential to improve student achievement, on task behavior, and motivation for learning (Lewis, 2005). Therefore, integrating technology in language teaching and especially in reading has increased. Many researches have been done concerning pros and cons of the delivery of the reading in online and offline format. In Castek, Zawilinski, McVerry, O'Byrne, and Leu (2011)'s study, students who are not good at print reading, surprisingly, read well in online learning context.

Studies searching for the effect of online vs. print reading materials on learners' scores are not many in number (Tanyeli, 2008; Coiro, 2011; Yang, 2012; O'Donnell, 2013). In Coiro (2011)'s study, contributions of online, offline reading skills and prior knowledge on reading comprehension has been investigated. The study was conducted on 109 seventh graders to evaluate whether online reading comprehension played a significant role on those learners performance over their offline reading comprehension. A survey of topic-specific prior knowledge and parallel scenario-based measures of online reading comprehension was used as well as a standardized reading comprehension scores were also collected. Results indicated that positive and significant inter-correlations between offline reading comprehension and online reading comprehension are found, and prior knowledge appear to be playing a significant role in online reading comprehension of readers with low level of online reading skills but not with high levels of online reading skills.

O'Donnell (2013) conducted a study on the correlation between online exercise scores and formative reading achievement to find the difference between the experimental group and control group. 47 participants enrolling in reading class were asked to do online exercises before the formative test. Fitting with a more student-centered autonomous learning approach, the study also showed that experimental group performed better than the control group.

In another study Yang (2012) looked at the reading difficulties in blended learning environment as well as the impact of blended learning on reading achievements. The study was conducted on 108 participants in total: one half of them were experimental group students while the other half was control group. Results of the study revealed that although there was not a statistically significant difference between pre- and post-test scores of control group, experimental group showed a great progress. This study indicated the effectiveness of blended learning environment in enhancing the participants' reading proficiency.

Similarly, Tanyeli (2008) investigated the efficiency of online English language instruction on students' reading skills between experiment and control group. Given pre- and post-test, the experiment group was given reading activities on the web while control group practiced the same activities using traditional methods in the class. Besides, providing a higher-level of learning to the experiment group, it was also found that there is an increase in the achievement of the students' reading skills when it is web assisted.

As for the reading strategies, Ramli, Darus, and Baka (2011) suggest that appropriate reading strategies can lead to success in reading comprehension. Anderson (2003, p.3) defines the strategies as

the conscious actions taken by the learners in order to improve their language learning by stating that “strategies are related to each other and must be viewed as a process and not as readers knowledge about reading and mechanisms they used when monitoring text comprehension. Students becoming aware of the strategies they used while reading and being informed about these strategies can facilitate their reading comprehension (Anderson, 2003).

Of relevance to the reading strategies, in recent research the concept of metacognition has become a trend in education (Brown, 1987; Boulware-Gooden, Carreker, Thornhill, & Joshi, 2007). Metacognition, in general, consists of the concepts like thinking about learning processes, planning learning, monitoring it and at the end evaluating (Oxford, 1990). In the context of second language reading, metacognition refers to the acquisition of second language reading and reading strategies (Oxford, 1990). Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002, cited by Ramli et al., 2011, p. 197) classified the following metacognitive strategies:

1. Global reading strategies – readers carefully plan their reading by using techniques, such as having purpose in mind and previewing text.
2. Problem Solving strategies – readers work directly with text to solve problems while reading, such as adjusting speed of reading, guessing meaning of unknown words, rereading text.
3. Support strategies – readers use basic support mechanisms to aid reading, such as using dictionaries, highlighting and taking notes.

There is a wealth of studies conducted in both online and print reading strategies used by learners and carried out to find the correlation between readers' strategy use and reading achievement (Anderson, 2003; Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2007; Cantrell & Carter, 2009; Hsieh, & Dwyer, 2009; Malcolm, 2009; Zhang & Wu, 2009; Hong-Nam, 2014; Hong-Nam, Leavell, Maher, 2014; Park, Yang, & Hsieh, 2014).

The study looking at the correlation between reading scores and strategy use of high school students showed that there is a statistically significant difference in strategy use and reading achievement (Hong-Nam, Leavell, Maher, 2014). In another study, Qanwal and Karim (2014) aimed to explore the correlation between reading strategies instruction and proficiency in text comprehension. After the use of both qualitative and quantitative methods to collect data, results indicated a strong positive correlation between reading strategies instruction and learners' proficiency in text comprehension. Apart from these studies, Park, Yang, and Hsieh (2014) have tried to understand how university level second language readers construct meaning during online reading, and found that they use prior knowledge to aid their online reading. In their study, Zhang and Wu (2009) found strategy use changed across the proficiency groups of high school readers in China. Global Strategies and Problem-Solving Strategies are used more commonly by high proficiency level learners than intermediate and low proficiency groups.

This thus study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent do online reading tasks affect Turkish EFL learners' reading test scores?
 - a. Do the learners who are assigned online reading tasks differ from the other learners who are not?
2. What is the relationship between learners' reading strategies and their reading test scores?

2. Method

The quantitative data was obtained from the reading comprehension test scores of 51 Turkish EFL learners enrolled in two preparatory classes at Hacettepe University, gathered through pre- and post-tests applied to them. Additionally, the quantitative data included the participants' responses to a questionnaire regarding their metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. The independent variable measured throughout the experiment was the strategies used by the participants. The dependent variable consisted of participants' scores on pre- and post-test evaluating their reading comprehension.

2.1. Context

The study was conducted in the School of Foreign Languages at Hacettepe University where each student enrolled is required to certify a certain level of English proficiency to be eligible for the freshman year. The minimum score required for exemption from the preparatory school program is 65 on the proficiency exam for those learners enrolled in a program where the medium of instruction is completely (100%) English, whereas it is 55 for the learners enrolled in a program where the medium of instruction is partially (30%) English. The learners who fail in the proficiency exam are required to take the Placement Test in order to determine the level of classes in which the learners will be enrolled. Placement Test consists of multiple choice questions with a focus on grammar, vocabulary and reading skills, whereas proficiency exam is composed of Listening Comprehension and Note-Taking, Reading Comprehension, Language Use and Writing sections. Each of the four sections is worth 25 points and the composite score of the exam is 100 points.

In the preparatory program, the levels of classes, curriculum and teaching objectives are aligned with the Common European Framework of Reference (2001). Accordingly, learners are divided into six levels: A1, A2, B1, B1+, B2, B2+. Learners with A1, A2, B1 and B1+ levels of proficiency receive 25 hours of instruction per week while learners with higher levels of proficiency (i.e., B2, B2+) take 20 hours of instruction each week. At all levels, eight hours a week is devoted to skill based courses (i.e., listening and speaking, reading and writing) and the rest of the weekly hours of instruction includes integrated courses aimed at improving general language knowledge of learners. Of eight hours, four hours is allocated to reading and writing classes. At B1, B1+, B2 and B2+ levels, the classes aim to develop not only academic reading skills of learners through several authentic texts but also their communication skills by engaging them in group discussions and negotiations.

As for the assessment of reading skills, at B1, B1+, B2, B2+ levels the learners take two listening quizzes with the purpose of measuring reading comprehension in each quarter. The contribution of reading comprehension quiz scores of learners to their overall grade is 10%. In addition to the quizzes, the level achievement tests administered to the learners at the end of each quarter contain a reading section similar to the ones given in the quizzes. The contribution of scores of learners obtained from reading section of the level achievement test to their overall grade is approximately 15%.

2.2. Sample / Participants

The participants in this study were Turkish-speaking adult learners of English. A total of 51 students were recruited in this study- 25 of them were assigned to the experimental group who were assigned online reading tasks during the term, and another 26 students to the control group who continued reading on paper. The English proficiency level of the participants was B1+ based on the Level Achievement Test conducted by school, which was also used as pre-test in order to be sure that both groups had similar proficiency levels. The learners were supposed to obtain at least 50 points out of 100 points on the level achievement test as they are enrolled in the departments where the medium of instruction is completely (30%) English. The departments of the learners are Medicine, Physics,

Statistics, Food Engineering, and Nursing, and Information Management. The numbers of learners enrolled in the departments of Medicine, Computer, Physics and Chemical Engineering are respectively 2, 5, 11, 15, and 18. All of the learners have been learning English as a foreign language for about 8 years.

2.3. Instrument(s)

A pre-test, which was paper-based, was given to the two groups consisting of 20 multiple choice and lasting 30 minutes, to ensure that both groups of learners were equal in terms of their proficiency. The test was the reading section of Level Achievement Test applied in the School of Foreign Languages to decide on whether students would pass to the next level or not.

With regard to the validity of the test, a group of expert judges, namely the head of the testing unit of the department and two coordinators, prepared the pre- and post-test and three teachers instructing in school of foreign languages were asked to proof the test to evaluate the appropriateness of the reading texts, clarity and the quality of instructions and questions. Thanks to the researchers' and experts' judgments, the validity of the test was tried to be established.

At the end of the online tasks given to the experiment group, again each group took Level Achievement Test as post-test. Post-test were not the same with the pre-test; however, it was in the same format with the pre-test and the level of the tests were the same.

To understand the participants' awareness of metacognitive strategies they have used in reading, Turkish version of Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSI, 2002) was applied to both groups after the pre-test. The Cronbach Alpha Coefficient of the Turkish version of the test was found to be .93 in Öztürk (2012)'s study, therefore, it can be accepted as a valid and reliable survey (Appendix-B).

As such, the adapted version of the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies inventory was composed of two sections (Appendix-B). In the first section, personal information about the participants' gender, age, and proficiency level was sought. The second section of the survey included 30 items categorized under three scales with different numbers of items each. The items of the first scale were 13 and related to the global reading strategies, the second scale was 8 and related to the problem-solving strategies, and the third one was 9 in number and related to the support reading strategies.

The adapted version of the survey was carried out in the original study. The total internal consistency reliability (KR-20) of 30 items in the survey was 0.84. Although this alpha score was not as high as the one found in the study of Öztürk (2012)'s study, this value was regarded as satisfactory in the current study given the homogeneous profile of the participants as freshman students and small sample size as Schmitt (1996) argues that alpha values of 0.5 would not attenuate validity. The alpha values for global reading, problem-solving, and support reading strategies subscales were 0.77, 0.49, and 0.46 respectively. Even though the KR-20 value of global reading subscale was satisfactory, other two subscales' scores had low reliability, which can be attributed to the few number of the participants.

2.4. Data collection procedures

A quasi-experimental design is used in which two groups were compared: an experiment and a control group. The groups were selected between B1+ level classes in order to have similar groups in terms of their level; therefore, convenience sampling was used. Before the application of online reading tasks, both groups of participants took the level achievement test and they had similar exam

score mean, which is 19.52 for experiment group and 20.05 for control group. After the participants assigned to two groups according to their scores, both groups were given Metacognitive Awareness Strategies Inventory (Marsi, 2002).

Following these steps, the experiment group, which consists of 25 B1+ level student, was sent online reading task via e-mail during six week (Appendix-A), while the control group, which consists of 26 students of B1+ level, were not given any online task but they continued their learning procedure. The reading tasks consisted of multiple choice questions and participants had to send their answers in three days to their teacher. For all the six tasks, the same process was followed.

2.5. Data analysis

Quantitative data obtained in this study were analyzed through SPSS Version 20.0. Paired-sample t-test was used separately for each group to see the differences between pre- and post-test scores. Also, independent-sample t-test was used for the post-test scores of two groups to understand whether the reading scores of experiment and control group differ from each other. With the help of these analyses, the first research question was answered.

To answer the second research question, the ANOVA procedure was used to determine whether there was a significant difference among the learners' mean scores on reading test with respect to the strategies they used (i.e., global reading, problem-solving, and support reading strategies). In this analysis, the independent variable was the participants' reading strategies (i.e., global reading, problem-solving, and support reading strategies), and the dependent variable was their scores on reading test.

3. Results

3.1. The Effects of online reading tasks on Turkish EFL learners' reading test scores

In order to answer the first research question addressing the effect of online reading tasks on Turkish EFL learners' reading test scores, pre-test scores of experiment and control group, pre- and post-test scores of both experiment group and control group, and at the end post-test scores of both groups were compared.

Results of pre-test scores

Table 1. Pre-test scores of experiment and control group

Groups	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Experiment	25	19.52	3.09	-0.523	0.603
Control	26	20.05	4.09		

Table 1 above shows the pre-test score averages of experiment group, who was given online reading tasks, and control group, who continued their traditional paper-based reading tasks. The pretest score average of the experiment group students who has given online reading tasks is 19.52, on the other hand, the pre-test score average of the control group students who has given paper based reading tasks is 20,05. An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare pre-test scores of experiment and control group in order to assess if there is a significant difference between them. There was not a statistically significant difference in scores of experiment group ($M=19.52$, $SD=3.09$) and

control group ($M=20.05$, $SD=4.09$); $t(49)=-0.523$, $p=0.603$. These results suggest that academic achievement levels of the experiment and control group are similar. Specifically, both groups are equal in terms of their reading scores and none of them have any superiority over the other group.

Results on the pre-test and post-test scores

Table 2. Pre-test and post-test scores of experiment group

	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Pre-test	25	19.52	3.09	-1.27	0.215
Post-test	25	20.72	3.82		

In order to determine if there is a significant difference between pre- and post-test scores of experiment group, a paired sample t-test was performed (Table-2). The results revealed that there was not a statistically significant difference between pre-test ($M=19.52$, $SD=3.09$) and post-test ($M=20.72$, $SD=3.82$) scores of experiment group; $t(24)=-1.27$, $p=0.215$. These results indicated that the online reading tasks did not affect students' reading achievement, in other words, it did not lead learners to score higher or perform better.

Table 3. Pre-test and post-test scores of control group

	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Pre-test	26	20.05	4.09	0.35	0.726
Post-test	26	19.73	4.99		

A paired sample t-test was computed to assess whether there is a significant difference between pre- and post-test scores of control group (Table-3). The results showed that there was not a statistically significant difference between pre-test ($M=20.05$, $SD=4.09$) and post-test ($M=19.73$, $SD=4.99$) scores of controls group; $t(25)=0.354$, $p=0.726$. What these results suggest is that learners in control group who went on their education in traditional environment did not show any progress in their reading scores.

Results of post-test scores

At the end of the application both groups were given the same reading test. An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare scores of experiment and control group on this post-test in order to understand if there is a significant difference between them (Table-4). It was found that there was not a statistically significant difference between the post-test scores of experiment group ($M=20.72$, $SD=3.82$) and control group ($M=19.73$, $SD=4.99$); $t(46.71)=0.796$, $p=0.430$. This indicates that learners in experiment and control group did not differ much in their reading scores after experiment group were given online reading tasks unlike control group.

Table 4. Post-test scores of experiment and control group

Groups	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Experiment	25	20.72	3.82	-0.796	0.430
Control	26	19.73	4.99		

Taken all the results gathered together, the first question and its sub question is answered. Results showed that online reading tasks did not affect Turkish EFL learners' reading test scores since no statistically significant difference was found between pre- and post-test scores of experiment group. Also, independent sample t-test results indicated that learners who were assigned online reading tasks did not differ from the learners who were not.

3.2. The relationship of reading test score to learners' reading strategies

Using the results of adapted Turkish version of Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (Marsi, 2002), learners' reading strategies (i.e., global reading, problem-solving, and support reading strategies) were identified. As seen in the Table-5, the most preferred strategy was amalgam strategy employed all of the three types of strategies together. However, there were not any participants who only preferred global reading or support reading strategies. In other words, learners did not have any preference of specific reading strategies, but made use of all of the three types of strategies.

Table 5. The Distribution of Learners Through the Learning Styles

		N	%
Valid	problem	12	8,0
	global-problem	4	12,0
	problem-support	5	4,0
	global-problem-support	5	76,0
	Total	25	100,0
Missing	System	0	0
	Total	25	100,0

The second research question involved the relationship between learners' reading strategies (i.e. global, problem-solving, support reading strategies) and their reading test scores. The goal was to see whether learners with specific reading strategies score higher or lower in reading comprehension tests than learners with other learning strategies. To figure out whether there was a significant difference among learners' mean scores of reading test with respect to reading strategies they used, a one-way ANOVA was run on the data. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of different types of reading strategies on reading test scores of students in experiment group. When the scores of learners on reading test were dependent variable, there was not a significant effect of strategies on reading test scores at the $p < .05$ level for four groups of learners with different strategy use in reading test [$F(3, 47) = .65, p=0.58$]. Therefore, since there was not a statistically significant effect of reading strategies on reading test scores, a post-hoc test was not required to be undertaken. Taken together, these results suggest that reading strategies used by learners do not have an effect on their reading test scores. Specifically, our results suggest that specific strategies used by learners do not lead to higher or lower grades on reading tests.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

In this study, it was reasoned that the use of online reading tasks could provide motivation to increase students' abilities in reading and reduce their stress level since they are accustomed to read

online thanks to the changes in technology. However, the results of these online reading tasks failed to support the notion that students will enhance their reading abilities. The comparison of experiment and control groups' scores on reading test applied as a post-test indicated that the online reading tasks assigned to the experiment group did not affect the experiment group' reading test scores. Although their mean scores in post-test is a little bit higher than their pre-test scores, and they scored slightly higher than the control group, no significant difference was found between experiment groups who were assigned online reading tasks and control group who were not assigned, which does not accords with the findings of O'Donnell (2013), Yang (2012), and Tanyeli (2008) in that the experimental group showed a progress in reading abilities. The lack of difference between experiment and control group may stem from the fact that online reading tasks may hinder reading comprehension for experiment group. Since these non-significant results caution educators and researchers about the use of technology in the language classroom and expectancies regarding online reading tasks potential to bring about changes in reading scores. As such, these results contribute to a more realistic understanding of the role of instructional technology in language classes. (Dupagne, Stacks, & Giroux, 2007)

Moreover, it was presumed that online reading tasks would be a continuous activity type succeeding to traditional reading tasks, but this assumption is perhaps misguided. Although it was assumed that learners will be more motivated to read online, they stated in the discussions conducted with them that they were not pleased with using technology for reading.

On the other hand, concerning the relationship between participants' reading strategies and their scores on reading test, the findings revealed that unlike the studies in literature (Zhang & Wu, 2009; Hong-Nam, Leavell, Maher, 2014; Qanwal & Karim, 2014) readings strategies did not show any effect on reading scores. The reason behind this might be the learners do not make use of only one strategy but make use of all of the three strategies during their readings.

Although these results are unexpected, it is necessary to emphasize that this quasi-experimental study can be a first step in understanding the effects of online reading tasks and reading strategies on reading comprehension. Yet, more research studies should be conducted before we draw final conclusions about the effectiveness of online reading tasks on students reading comprehension.

Owing to the constraints of time, this study was conducted on low proficiency L2 learners; however, it would yield more informative and contributing scores if the participants were high proficiency learners. In addition, this time may be too short to test the impact of online reading tasks on participants' scores since it may not lead any changes. Finally, the current study involved only a small number of students as participants, yet having more participants would provide more reliable and precise results.

The findings of this study have implications for practitioners and test developers. Since real-life language tasks usually include the readers being able to read online, these kinds of activities involving technology should be incorporated into classroom reading tasks rigorously. In addition, teachers can teach some reading strategies to their learners by providing classroom tasks where students can experiment with reading online.

References

Please Anderson, N. J. 2003. Scrolling, clicking, and searching english: online reading strategies in a second/foreign language. *The Reading Matrix*, 3(3), 1-33.

Boulware-Gooden, R., Carreker, S., Thornhill, A., & Joshi, R. M. (2007). Instruction of metacognitive strategies enhances reading comprehension and vocabulary achievement of third-grade students. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(1), 70-77.

Brown, A. L. (1987). Metacognition, executive control, self-regulation, and other more mysterious mechanisms. In F. E. Weinert & R. H. Kluwe (Eds.), *Metacognition, motivation, and understanding* (pp. 65-116). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cantrell, C. S., & Carter, J. (2009). Relationships among learner characteristics and adolescents' perceptions about reading strategy use. *Reading Psychology*, 30, 195-224.

Castek, J., Zawilinski, L., McVerry, G., O'Byrne, I., & Leu, D. J. (2011). The new literacies of online reading comprehension: new opportunities and challenges for students with learning difficulties. In C. Wyatt-Smith, J. Elkins, & S. Gunn (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on difficulties in learning literacy and numeracy* (pp. 91-110). New York, NY: Springer.

Coiro, J. (2011). Predicting reading comprehension on the Internet: Contributions of offline reading skills, online reading skills, and prior knowledge. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 43(4), 352- 392.

Dupagne, M., Stacks, D. W., Giroux, V. M. (2006-2007). Effects of video streaming technology on public speaking students' communication apprehension and competence. *J. Educational Technology Systems*, 35(4), 479-490.

Hong-Nam, K. (2014). ELL High School Students' Metacognitive awareness of reading strategy use and reading proficiency. *TESL-EJ*, 18(1), 1-16.

Hong-Nam, K., & Leavell, A. G. (2011). Reading strategy instruction, metacognitive awareness, and self-perception of striving college developmental readers. *Journal of College Learning and Literacy*, 37, 3-17.

Hong-Nam, K., Leavell, G., & Maher, S. (2014). Reading strategy instruction, metacognitive awareness, and self-perception of striving college developmental readers. *Reading Psychology*, 35(8), 762-790. doi: 10.1080/02702711.2013.807900

Hsieh, P. H., & Dwyer, F. (2009). The instructional effect of online reading strategies and learning styles on student academic achievement. *Educational Technology & Society*, 12(2), 36-50.

Ji, S., W., Michaels, S., & Waterman, D. (2014). Print vs. electronic readings in college courses: cost-efficiency and perceived learning. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 21, 17-24.

Kayaoğlu, M. N., & Akbaş, R. D. (2014). Prospective English teachers' habits and perceptions of online reading. *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction*, 4(3), 19-34.

Lewis, R. B, (2005). Classroom technology for students with learning disabilities. In D. Edyburn, K. Higgins, & R. Boone (Eds.), *Handbook of special education technology research and practice* (pp.325-334). Whitefish Bay, WI: Knowledge by Design, Inc.

Liu, Z. (2006). Print vs. electronic resources: a study of user perceptions, preferences, and use. *Information Processing and Management: An International Journal*, 42(2), 583- 592.

Malcolm, D. (2009). Reading strategy awareness of Arabic-speaking medical students studying in English. *System*, 37, 640-651.

Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. (2002). Metacognitive awareness of reading strategies inventory. Retrieved from http://dayofreading.org/DOR10HO/MARSI_2002.pdf

Mokhtari, K.; Sheorey, R. 2002. Measuring ESL students' awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 25(3), 2-10.

O'Donnell, L (2013). The correlation between online exercise scores and formative reading achievement. Paper presented at 3rd Annual International Conference on Education & e-Learning, Singapore. Retrieved from <http://0eds.b.ebscohost.com.library.metu.edu.tr/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=af13458554a7-4d12-9901-69e4f2d4d1dd%40sessionmgr114&vid=4&hid=120>

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know.* Newbury, NY: House Publisher.

Öztürk, E. (2012). The validity and reliability of the Turkish version of the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies inventory. *Elementary Education Online*, 11(2), 292-305.

Park, J., Yang, J., & Hsieh, Y. C. (2014). University level second language readers' online reading and comprehension strategies. *Language Learning & Technology*, 18(3), 148- 172.

Ramli, N. F. M., Darus, S., & Baka, N. A. (2011). Metacognitive online reading strategies of adult ESL learners using a learning management system. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(3), 195-204.

Schmitt, N. (1996). Uses and abuses of coefficient alpha. *Psychological Assessment*, 8(4), 350-353.

Tanyeli, N. (2008). The efficiency of online English language instruction on students' reading skills. Paper presented at the International Technology, Education and Development (INTED) Conference, Valencia, Spain. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED504676.pdf>

Yang, Y. (2012). Blended learning for college students with English reading difficulties. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 25(5), 393-410, doi: 10.1080/09588221.2011.597767

Zhang, L. J., & Wu, A. (2009). Chinese senior high school EFL students' metacognitive awareness and reading-strategy use. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 21(1), 37-59.

Appendix A. Online Reading Task

The Death Car: Reading Comprehension

Read the story and answer the questions.

It was a cold night in September. The rain was drumming on the car roof as George and Marie Winston drove through the empty country roads towards the house of their friends, the Harrisons, where they were going to attend a party to celebrate the engagement of the Harrisons' daughter, Lisa. As they drove, they listened to the local radio station, which was playing classical music. They were about five miles from their destination when the music on the radio was interrupted by a news announcement:

"The Cheshire police have issued a serious warning after a man escaped from Colford Mental Hospital earlier this evening. The man, John Downey, is a murderer who killed six people before he was captured two years ago. He is described as large, very strong and extremely dangerous. People in the Cheshire area are warned to keep their doors and windows locked, and to call the police immediately if they see anyone acting strangely."

Marie shivered. "A crazy killer. And he's out there somewhere. That's scary."

"Don't worry about it," said her husband. "We're nearly there now. Anyway, we have more important things to worry about. This car is losing power for some reason -- it must be that old problem with the carburetor. If it gets any worse, we'll have to stay at the Harrisons' tonight and get it fixed before we travel back tomorrow."

As he spoke, the car began to slow down. George pressed the accelerator, but the engine only coughed. Finally they rolled to a halt, as the engine died completely. Just as they stopped, George pulled the car off the road, and it came to rest under a large tree.

"Blast!" said George angrily. "Now we'll have to walk in the rain."

"But that'll take us an hour at least," said Marie. "And I have my high-heeled shoes and my nice clothes on. They'll be ruined!"

"Well, you'll have to wait while I run to the nearest house and call the Harrisons. Someone can come out and pick us up," said George.

"But George! Have you forgotten what the radio said? There's a homicidal maniac out there! You can't leave me alone here!"

"You'll have to hide in the back of the car. Lock all the doors and lie on the floor in the back, under this blanket. No-one will see you. When I come back, I'll knock three times on the door. Then you can get up and open it. Don't open it unless you hear three knocks." George opened the door and slipped out into the rain. He quickly disappeared into the blackness.

Marie quickly locked the doors and settled down under the blanket in the back for a long wait. She was frightened and worried, but she was a strong-minded woman. She had not been waiting long, however, when she heard a strange scratching noise. It seemed to be coming from the roof of the car.

Marie was terrified. She listened, holding her breath. Then she heard three slow knocks, one after the other, also on the roof of the car. Was it her husband? Should she open the door? Then she heard another knock, and another. This was not her husband. It was somebody -- or something -- else. She was shaking with fear, but she forced herself to lie still. The knocking continued -- bump, bump, bump, bump.

Many hours later, as the sun rose, she was still lying there. She had not slept for a moment. The knocking had never stopped, all night long. She did not know what to do. Where was George? Why had he not come for her?

Suddenly, she heard the sound of three or four vehicles, racing quickly down the road. All of them pulled up around her, their tires screeching on the road. At last! Someone had come! Marie sat up quickly and looked out of the window.

The three vehicles were all police cars, and two still had their lights flashing. Several policemen leapt out. One of them rushed towards the car as Marie opened the door. He took her by the hand.

"Get out of the car and walk with me to the police vehicle. miss. You're safe now. Look straight ahead. Keep looking at the police car. Don't look back. Just don't look back."

Something in the way he spoke filled Marie with cold horror. She could not help herself. About ten yards from the police car, she stopped, turned and looked back at the empty vehicle.

George was hanging from the tree above the car, a rope tied around his neck. As the wind blew his body back and forth, his feet were bumping gently on the roof of the car -- bump, bump, bump, bump.

1. Where were the Winstons going when this incident happened?
 - A. home
 - B. to Colford Mental Hospital
 - C. to a party
 - D. to the police station
2. What was the reason for the news announcement on the radio?
 - A. Six people, including John Downey, had been murdered.
 - B. A dangerous prisoner had escaped.
 - C. The police were warning of accidents on the roads in the bad weather.
 - D. Some people had been seen acting strangely in the Cheshire area.
3. What did George think was causing the trouble with the car?
 - A. the carburetor
 - B. the rain drumming on the roof
 - C. the accelerator
 - D. he had no idea
4. Why did he pull the car off the road?
 - A. to have a rest
 - B. to go for a walk
 - C. to walk to the nearest house
 - D. it broke down
5. Why did Marie stay in the car when George left?
 - A. She was afraid to go out in the dark.
 - B. So no one would steal the car.
 - C. Her clothes weren't suitable for the rain.
 - D. She wanted to get some sleep.
6. Where did George set off to walk to?
 - A. the Mental Hospital
 - B. the nearest house
 - C. the Harrisons' house
 - D. the police station
7. What made Marie so frightened as she waited in the car?
 - A. There was a strange sound coming from the roof.
 - B. She could see a man acting strangely outside the car.
 - C. Some police cars came racing down the road.
 - D. She was afraid of the rain and the dark.
8. Why did the policeman tell her not to look back when he brought her out of the car?
 - A. He didn't want her to see the body of her husband.
 - B. The killer was waiting behind her.
 - C. He wanted her to forget everything that had happened during the night.
 - D. He didn't want her to see the damage done to the car.
9. Marie says, "There's a homicidal maniac out there!" What does "homicidal maniac" mean?
 - A. terrible storm
 - B. busy road
 - C. crazy killer
 - D. Policeman
10. In "Several policemen leapt out," "leapt" means
 - A. threw

- B. jumped
- C. shouted
- D. drove

Appendix B. Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (Marsi, 2002)

ANKET: Okuma Stratejileri Üst Bilişsel Farkındalık Envanteri

Devam ettiğiniz sınıf ve kur (seviyeniz) :

Yaşınız :

Cinsiyetiniz :

Bölümünüz :

Kaç yıldır İngilizce öğreniyorsunuz :

Yönerge: Aşağıdaki 30 sorudan oluşan anket İngilizce materyalleri okurken kullandığınız stratejileri belirlemeye yönelik olarak oluşturulmuştur. Soruların doğru veya yanlış cevabı yoktur. Akliniza gelen ilk cevap sizin doğru tutumunuzu en iyi yansitan olacaktır.

Stratejiler hakkındaki ifadeler listelenmiştir. Her bir ifade (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) numaralandırılmış ve numaraların anlamları aşağıda verilmiştir.

- 1 anlamı “ Ben bunu asla ya da neredeyse hiç yapmam”
- 2 anlamı “ Ben bunu nadiren yaparım”
- 3 anlamı “ Ben bunu ara sıra yaparım”
- 4 anlamı “ Ben bunu genellikle yaparım”
- 5 anlamı “ Ben bunu daima ya da neredeyse her zaman yaparım”

Her bir madde için yaklaşınızı temsil eden cevabı (1=Asla, 2=Bazen, 3=Ara sıra, 4=Genellikle, 5=Her zaman) daire içine alınız. Lütfen tüm maddeleri cevaplandırınız.

So ru no	Soru	Asla	Nadire	Ara sıra	Genellikle	Her zaman
1	Okurken zihnimde bir amaç vardır.	1	2	3	4	5
2	Okurken, okuduğumu anlamak için notlar alırı.	1	2	3	4	5
3	Okuduğumu anlamama yardım edecek neler biliyorum diye düşünürüm.	1	2	3	4	5

4	Okumaya başlamadan önce ne konuda olduğunu anlamak için metni gözden geçiririm.	1	2	3	4	5
5	Metin zor geldiğinde okuduğumu anlamak için yüksek sesle okurum.	1	2	3	4	5
6	Metindeki önemli noktalar üzerinde düşünmek için okuduğumu özetlerim.	1	2	3	4	5
7	Okuma amacıyla metnin içindekilerin uyup uymayacağını düşünürüm.	1	2	3	4	5
8	Okuduğumu anladığımdan emin olmak için yavaş ama dikkatli okurum.	1	2	3	4	5
9	Anladığımın doğru olup olmadığını kontrol etmek için başkalarıyla tartışırıım.	1	2	3	4	5
10	Öncelikle uzunluk ve düzenlemeye gibi konulardaki özelliklerine okumadan önce göz gezdiririm.	1	2	3	4	5
11	Konsantrasyonumu kaybedersem tekrar dikkatimi toplarım.	1	2	3	4	5
12	Hatırlamama yardımcı olsun diye metnin bazı bölümlerini yuvarlak içine alırım veya bu bölümlein altını çizerim.	1	2	3	4	5
13	Okuma hızımı okuduğum metne göre ayarlarım	1	2	3	4	5
14	Neleri dikkatle okuyup neleri önemsemeyeceğime karar veririm.	1	2	3	4	5
15	Okuduğumu anlamama yardımcı olması için sözlük gibi kaynaklardan.	1	2	3	4	5
16	Metin zor geldiğinde okuduğum şeye dikkatimi daha çok veririm.	1	2	3	4	5
17	Metni anlamam kolaylaşın diye tablo, resim ve şekillerden faydalananırm.	1	2	3	4	5
18	Okuduklarım hakkında düşünmek için zaman zaman dururum.	1	2	3	4	5
19	Okuduğumu daha iyi anlamama yardımcı olması için içerik ipuçlarını kullanırm.	1	2	3	4	5
20	Okuduğumu daha iyi anlamak için metindeki düşünceleri kendi sözcüklerimle yeniden ifade ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
21	Okuduğumu hatırlamama yardımcı olsun diye metnin bazı bölümlerini zihnimde resimler veya görsel olarak canlandırırm.	1	2	3	4	5
22	Ana bilgiyi belirlemek için kalın font ve yatkı harf gibi yazımsal yardımcıları kullanırm.	1	2	3	4	5
23	Metindeki bilgi ve bulguları değerlendirdip analiz ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
24	Metinde ileri ve geri gidip düşünceler arasındaki ilişkileri bulurum.	1	2	3	4	5
25	Çelişen bilgilere rastladığında düşüncelerimi gözden geçiririm.	1	2	3	4	5

26	Okurken metnin ne hakkında olduğunu tahmin ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
27	Metin zorlaşırsa anlamama yardımcı olsun diye yeniden okumalar yaparım.	1	2	3	4	5
28	Metinde cevaplanmasını istedigim soruları kendime sorarım.	1	2	3	4	5
29	Metinlarındaki tahminimin doğru ya da yanlış olduğunu kontrol etmek için görmek isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
30	Cümle ya da kelimelerin bilinmeyen anlamlarını tahmin etmeye çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5

Çevrimiçi okuma aktivitelerinin ve okuma stratejilerinin İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin okuma sınavı puanları üzerindeki etkisi

Öz

Teknolojinin yabancı dil eğitimi alanına dâhil edilmesi araştırmacıların uzun süredir dikkatini çekmektedir. Fakat çoğunlukla karmaşık ve birbirileyle çelişkili sonuçlara ulaşılmıştır. Bununla birlikte öğrencilerin üstbilişsel okuma stratejileri ve okuma sınavlarındaki başarılarını araştıran çok fazla çalışmaya rastlanmamıştır. Bu çalışmanın amacı bu nedenle Türkiye'deki bir devlet üniversitesindeki İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin çevrimiçi okuma aktivitelerinin ve üstbilişsel okuma stratejilerinin onların okuma sınavı puanlarına etkisini araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu çalışmaya toplam 51 Türkçeyi ana dili olarak konuşan öğrenci katılmıştır. Bunlardan deney grubundaki 25 katılımcıya çevrimiçi okuma parçaları ödev verilmiş ve kontrol grubundaki 26 kişi ise okuma parçalarını kâğıt üzerinde yapmaya devam etmiştir. Her iki gruba da 20 tane çoktan seçmeli sorudan oluşan ve 30 dakika süren ön-test ve son-test verilmiştir. Üstbilişsel okuma stratejilerini belirlemek içinse Mokhtari and Reichard'ın (2002) Üstbilişsel Okuma Stratejileri Farkındalık Envanteri'nin Türkçe versiyonu uygulanmıştır. Deney ve kontrol gruplarının ön-test ve son-test sonuçları ile okuma stratejileri envanterine verdikleri cevaplar SPSS 20.0 programı ile istatistiksel olarak analiz edilmiştir. Sonuçlar 6 haftalık uygulamanın ardından deney ve kontrol grubunun okuma sınav sonuçlarında istatistiksel olarak hiçbir anlamlı farklılık olmadığını göstermiştir. Bununla birlikte tek yönlü ANOVA sonuçları da öğrenciler tarafından uygulanan hiçbir stratejinin okuma puanlarına etkisi olmadığını göstermiştir. Sonuç olarak çevrimiçi okuma aktivitelerinin ve okuma stratejilerinin öğrencilerin okuma becerileri üzerinde hiçbir etkisi olmadığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Çalışma sonucunda ilgililerin sınıflarda teknoloji kullanımı ve çevrimiçi okuma aktivitelerinin okuma puanlarında değişikliğe sebep olma potansiyelilarındaki bekentileri konusunda dikkatli olmaları gereği vurgulanmıştır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Çevrimiçi okuma aktiviteleri; üstbilişsel okuma stratejileri; okuma sınav sonuçları

AUTHOR BIODATA

İsmail Fırat Altay an Assistant Professor at Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education, Department of Foreign Language Teaching, Division of English Language Teaching. After graduating from Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education, Department of Foreign Language Teaching, he completed his MA and PhD at the same university in English Language Education. He was a Fulbright scholar in USA for a year as a Foreign Language

Teaching Assistant during PhD studies. His fields of interest include teaching language skills, pronunciation teaching and foreign language testing.

Ayşe Altay is an instructor at Hacettepe University, School of Foreign Languages. She is pursuing her MA degree at Middle East Technical University, Faculty of Education, Department of Foreign Language teaching, Division of English Language Teaching. She got her BA degree from Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education, Department of Foreign Language Education, Division of English Language Teaching. Her main research interests are Computer Assisted Language Learning, and Testing in Foreign Language Education.